

CORRES. CONTROL
OUTGOING LTR. NO.

DOE ORDER # _____

95-RF-07016

DIST. LTR ENC

BENSUSSEN, S.

BUHL, T.

CARD, R. G.

MANI, V.

MARTINEZ, L.

MCKAY, B.

O'BRIEN, G.

TUOR, N.

VOORHEIS, G.

WALLER, C.

HEDAH, T. G. X X

HILL, J. A.

SHELTON, D. C.

WHALEY, D. L.

BOYD, R. H.

DETAMORE, J. A.

DORR, K. A.

HAHN, S. J. X X

KENNEDY, C. E.

LAHOUD, R. G.

POTTER, G. L.

SIEBEN, A. K.

STEINAUER, A. T.

WIEMELT, K. L.

Brooks, L. X X

CORRES. CTRL. X X

TRAFFIC

ADMIN. REC.

PATS

CLASSIFICATION:

UCN

UNCLASSIFIED X X

CONFIDENTIAL

SECRET

AUTHORIZED CLASSIFIER

SIGNATURE

Dr. Class. Rev. Waiver

per Class. Office

Date: 9-7-95

IN REPLY TO RF CC NO:

None

ACTION ITEM STATUS

PARTIAL/OPEN

CLOSED

LTR APPROVALS: SH

Tot

ORIG & TYPIST INITIALS

SHJ kam



KAISER-HILL
COMPANY

September 7, 1995

95-RF-07016

Jessie M. Roberson, Assistant Manager
Environmental Restoration
DOE, RFFO

ADMIN RECORD

Attn: W. Fitch

NO ACTION/NO FURTHER ACTION DECISION CRITERIA DOCUMENT - TGH-257-95

Action: Forward copies of the No Action/No Further Action Decision Criteria for Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site Document to the Environmental Protection Agency and the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment

Enclosed is the document titled, "No Action/No Further Action (NFA) Decision Criteria for Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site and Memorandum of Understanding" (Enclosure 1) for your review and transmittal to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) (Enclosure 2). This document presents the sitewide NFA criteria for the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site as defined by Performance Measure 95-ER-003.

Please request a meeting with the EPA, CDPHE, the Department of Energy, Rocky Flats Field Office, and Kaiser-Hill to discuss the document and obtain conceptual agreement on the NFA strategy.

If you have any questions, please call Laura Brooks at extension 6130.

T. G. Hedahl, Director
ER/WM&I Operations

SJH:kam

Orig. and 1 cc - J. M. Roberson

Enclosures:
As Stated (2)

cc: (w/o Enclosures)

N. A. Holsteen - RMRS

J. E. Law - "

J. L. McAnally - "

A. M. Parker - "

R. Randall - "

D. L. Schubbe - "

ER Project File (2)

RMRS Records

DOCUMENT CLASSIFICATION
REVIEW WAIVER PER
CLASSIFICATION OFFICE

Kaiser-Hill Company, L.L.C.

Courier Address: Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site, State Hwy. 93 and Cactus, Rocky Flats, CO 80007 • 303.966.7000

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 464, Golden, Colorado 80402-0464

A-SW-002153

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

Mr. Martin Hestmark
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region VIII
ATTN: Rocky Flats Project Manager, 8HWM-RI
999 18th Street, Suite 500, 8WM-C
Denver, Colorado 80202-2405

Mr. Joe Schieffelin, Unit Leader
Hazardous Waste Control Program
Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
4300 Cherry Creek Drive South
Denver, Colorado 80222-1530

Gentlemen:

Enclosed is the document titled, "No Action/No Further Action (NFA) Decision Criteria for Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site and Memorandum of Understanding" for your review. This document presents the sitewide NFA criteria for the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site as defined by Performance Measure 95-ER-003.

Please request a meeting with the Environmental Protection Agency, the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, the Department of Energy, Rocky Flats Field Office, and Kaiser-Hill to discuss the document and obtain conceptual agreement on the NFA strategy.

If you have any questions concerning this correspondence, please contact _____ at _____.

Enclosure:
As Stated

ADMIN RECORD

NO ACTION/NO FURTHER ACTION (NFA)
DECISION CRITERIA FOR
ROCKY FLATS ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGY SITE
AND MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Rocky Mountain Remediation Services, L. L. C.
P.O. Box 464
Golden, Colorado 80402-0464

September 1, 1995

DOCUMENT CLASSIFICATION
REVIEW WAIVER PER
CLASSIFICATION OFFICE

September 1, 1995

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

It is the understanding of the undersigned that the No Action/No Further Action (NFA) Decision Criteria presented herein will be used as guidance for determining which Individual Hazardous Substance Sites (IHSSs), Source Areas (SA), Operable Units (OUs), or Areas of Concern (AOCs) at the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site (RFETS) may become candidates for an NFA decision. These NFA decision criteria meet the requirements set forth in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA). Further, these criteria provide a process for fulfilling the site-closure requirements under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), as administered through the Colorado Hazardous Waste Act (CHWA) for those RCRA-lead IHSSs. It is also the understanding of the undersigned that this document may be amended as required by changes in the regulatory environment or as the NFA process evolves.

APPROVED BY THE RFETS QUALITY ACTION TEAM:

U.S. Department of Energy

Date

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region VIII

Date

Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment

Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Objectives	1
1.2 Regulatory Basis for NFA Decisions	2
1.2.1 CERCLA Guidance	2
1.2.2 RCRA Guidance	3
1.3 Exposure Pathway—Generic Site Conceptual Model	5
2.0 CRITERIA FOR NFA DECISIONS	8
2.1 Source Evaluation	8
2.2 Background Comparisons	10
2.3 Risk-Based Screening of Chemicals	13
2.3.1 CDPHE Conservative Screen	13
2.3.2 Screening-Level Risk Evaluation	16
2.3.3 Ecological Risk Assessment Tier 2 Screen	19
2.4 CERCLA Baseline Risk Assessment	22
2.4.1 Human Health Risk Assessment Methodology	23
2.4.2 Ecological Risk Assessment Methodology	25
3.0 NFA DECISION DOCUMENTATION	28
3.1 NFA Justification Documents	28
3.2 NFA Decision Agreements	30
4.0 REFERENCES	31

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	Exposure Pathway—Generic Site Conceptual Model	6
Figure 2	Decision Points for NFA Recommendations	9
Figure 3	Background Comparison/PCOC Selection	12
Figure 4	CDPHE Conservative Screen	14
Figure 5	Screening-level Risk Evaluation	18
Figure 6	Screening-Level ERA	20
Figure 7	Human Health Risk Assessment Process	24
Figure 8	Ecological Risk Assessment Process at RFETS	26

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Generalized Table of Contents for an NFA Justification Document	29
---------	---	----

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AOC	Areas of Concern
ARAR	Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement
BRA	Baseline Risk Assessment
CAD/ROD	Corrective Action Decision/Record of Decision
CDPHE	Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CHWA	Colorado Hazardous Waste Act
CHWR	Colorado Hazardous Waste Regulations
COC	Chemical of Concern
DOE	Department of Energy
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ERA	Ecological Risk Assessment
ERAM	Ecological Risk Assessment Methodology
HI	Hazard Index
HQ	Hazard Quotient
IAG	Interagency Agreement
IHSS	Individual Hazardous Substance Site
IM/IRA	Interim Measure/ Interim Remedial Action
NFA	No Action/No Further Action
NFADA	NFA Decision Agreement
NFAJD	NFA Justification Document
OU	Operable Unit
PCOC	Potential Chemical of Concern
PPRG	Programmatic Preliminary Remediation Goal
RAGS	Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund
RBCs	Risk-Based Concentrations
RCRA	Resource Conservation & Recovery Act
RFETS	Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site

No Action/No Further Action
Decision Criteria for RFETS

September 1, 1995

RFI/RI	RCRA Facility Investigation/Remedial Investigation
RME	Reasonably Maximum Exposed
SA	Source Area
SWMU	Solid Waste Management Unit
TM	Technical Memorandum
UTL	Upper Tolerance Limit
VOC	Volatile Organic Compound

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Presented in this document are No Action/No Further Action (NFA) decision criteria and NFA decision documentation requirements to be used as guidance for determining the applicability of an NFA decision to sites (e.g., Individual Hazardous Substance Sites [IHSSs], Source Areas [SAs], Operable Units [OUs], Areas of Concern [AOC]) at the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site (RFETS), Golden, Colorado.

The NFA decision process presented within this document meets the substantive requirements to support an NFA remedy selection for a Corrective Action Decision/Record of Decision (CAD/ROD). In addition, administrative requirements for coordination of NFA decisions with the CAD/ROD process and with RCRA closures at RFETS are discussed in this document. Individual steps within the NFA decision process which have been consolidated in this document have already been successfully used at RFETS and have been referenced from EPA Guidance Documents, the Interagency Agreement, and EPA and CDPHE RFETS specific guidance (e.g., letters). The steps, in order of performance, can be summarized as follows:

1. Conduct source evaluation (with available data/information). If a review of historical release information/data reveal that no existing source can be found, the exposure pathway is incomplete and the IHSS can be recommended for NFA. Lack of contaminant source is the only element of an incomplete exposure pathway that can be addressed without undertaking a full risk assessment.
2. Conduct a background comparison. If a review of historical release information/data indicates that a contaminant source may be present, an IHSS, usually as part of an OU, will undergo a background comparison. A background comparison is performed to distinguish between constituents that are associated with site activities and those associated with background conditions. If medium-specific environmental data collected from an IHSS are shown to be at or below background levels for inorganic chemicals,

and no organic chemicals are detected in that medium, that IHSS may become a candidate for NFA.

3. Conduct a risk-based screen. The purpose of conducting a risk-based screen is to reduce the number of IHSSs that are required to undergo a CERCLA baseline risk assessment. For OUs currently in the RFI/RI process, human health risks have been screened using the CDPHE conservative screen. Human health risks for future IHSS evaluations will be conducted using the screening-level risk evaluation initiated while developing the IHSS risk-based prioritization methodology. Ecological risks are screened using Tier 2 of the Ecological Risk Assessment process. If an IHSS or source area passes both the human health and ecological risk-based screens, then that IHSS becomes a candidate for NFA.
4. Perform a Baseline Risk Assessment (BRA). The BRA consists of a human health risk assessment (conducted on an exposure area) and an ecological risk assessment (conducted by drainage area). If the results of the BRA estimate that the risks to human health and the environment are within acceptable levels, the IHSS becomes a candidate for NFA.

The remedy selection process must be documented to support a NFA decision. For those sites not evaluated as part of an RFI/RI, an NFA Justification Document (NFAJD) must be prepared to present an evaluation of existing information and data to support a scientifically and legally defensible NFA decision. For those sites evaluated within an RFI/RI Report or a Letter Report (i.e., a report generated as part of the CDPHE conservative screen), an NFAJD is not necessary. In these cases, rationale for an NFA decision will be provided in an NFA Decision Agreement (NFADA), which will become the foundation for the CAD/ROD and Proposed Plan.

This guidance is intended to make the NFA decision making process simple and clear.

Similarly, NFA documents should be as concise as possible. Defining the NFA decision making process should rely on existing, easily obtainable data.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objectives

The purpose of this document is to present guidance for formal approval by the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) for implementing the process for determining those sites (e.g., Individual Hazardous Substance Sites [IHSSs], Source Areas [SAs], Operable Units [OUs], Areas of Concern [AOCs]) at the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site (RFETS), Golden, Colorado for which a No Action/No Further Action (NFA) decision is applicable. Various processes that meet the substantive requirements in support of NFA remedy selection have been consolidated in this document to support adoption of NFA Corrective Action Decisions/Records of Decision (CAD/RODs) at RFETS.

Presented in this document are NFA decision criteria and requirements for NFA decision documentation that ultimately can be used in the preparation of a CAD/ROD or in a RCRA closure. Administrative requirements for coordination of NFA closures at RFETS are discussed briefly in the Section 3.0 on NFA decision documentation. The primary benefits for having a preapproved NFA decision process include the following:

- Accelerate IHSS decisionmaking and closures by not having to redevelop the NFA process for each closure.
- Track the status of successful closures at RFETS more accurately on an IHSS-by-IHSS basis. Each IHSS, SA, AOC, or OU that has been accepted for an NFA decision will document that no unacceptable risk exists in that area, which will provide support for the eventual closure of RFETS.
- Eliminate negative cost and schedule impacts. Once an area has been accepted for an NFA decision, any work that is scheduled to occur within that area (e.g., routine monitoring or maintenance) should not require all the paperwork or the personal protective equipment that would be needed in a contaminated (real or suspected) area. This would save time, money, and reduce the amount of waste generated.

- Limit the number and length of documents to be produced, thus reducing review time and cost of document production.
- Accelerate cleanup at RFETS by allowing resources to be directed at high priority sites.

1.2 Regulatory Basis for NFA Decisions

On January 22, 1991, the DOE, the CDPHE, and the EPA entered into a tri-party agreement (Interagency Agreement [IAG]), as directed by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) and the corrective action section of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), for the management of Rocky Flats Facility cleanup. This agreement was made to ensure that: (1) environmental impacts associated with past and present activities at the Rocky Flats Site would continue to be thoroughly investigated; (2) appropriate response actions would be taken; and (3) response actions would be completed as necessary to protect human health, welfare, and the environment. This framework identified the necessity of joint environmental regulatory processes to fulfill the requirements of RCRA and CERCLA. The IAG identified the required methodology for remedial actions, permit modifications, closures, and corrective actions for cleanup at Rocky Flats. This NFA decision criteria document expands on the site-specific methodology for making NFA decisions at RFETS, using the regulatory guidance provided by CERCLA and RCRA.

1.2.1 CERCLA Guidance

Section 117 of CERCLA, as amended by SARA of 1986, requires the issuance of decision documents for remedial actions taken pursuant to sections 104, 106, 120, and 122. In response to these regulations, the EPA developed *Guidance on Preparing Superfund Decision Documents* (EPA, 1992) and a Quick Reference Fact Sheet entitled *Guide to Developing Superfund No Action, Interim Action, and Contingency Remedy RODs* (EPA, 1991a). EPA has also produced a *Record of Decision Checklist for No Action* (EPA, undated) to aid in the development of NFA decision documents and in the process of obtaining an NFA decision. EPA OSWER Directive 9355.0-30 (EPA, 1991b) was written to clarify the role of the baseline risk assessment in developing Superfund remedial alternatives and supporting risk

management decisions. These documents are the basis upon which this current NFA decision criteria document for RFETS is built.

From the NFA Quick Reference Fact Sheet (EPA, 1991), a no-action decision may be warranted under three general sets of circumstances:

1. When the site or a specific problem or area of the site (e.g., an operable unit or an IHSS) poses no current or potential threat to human health or the environment (a no-action decision);
2. When CERCLA does not provide the authority to take remedial action; or
3. When a previous response eliminated the need for further remedial response (a no-further-action decision).

EPA (1992) defines no action as "no treatment, engineering controls, or institutional controls." Remedial alternatives that include solely institutional controls are not considered "no action." An alternative may include monitoring and still be considered "no action."

OSWER Directive 9355.0-30 (EPA, 1991b) states that: "If the baseline risk assessment and the comparison of exposure concentrations to chemical-specific standards indicates that there is no unacceptable risk to human health or the environment and that no remedial action is warranted, then the CERCLA Section 121 cleanup standards for selection of a Superfund remedy, including the requirements to meet applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs), are not triggered."

1.2.2 RCRA Guidance

A RCRA corrective action is used to clean up hazardous waste or hazardous waste constituents released from any solid waste management unit (SWMU) at a permitted facility, as codified in 42 USC 6924 section 3004(u).

The State of Colorado was authorized, by the EPA, to manage hazardous waste requirements within its boundaries through the Colorado Hazardous Waste Act (CHWA). CDPHE, through its Hazardous Material and Waste Management Division, promulgated regulation in 6 CCR 1007-3 for the proper handling of hazardous waste and constituents. The Corrective Action Program for any SWMU is defined in section 264.101 of those regulations.

On November 16, 1993, CDPHE provided additional guidance for closure requirements, corrective action requirements, and other program requirements. This guidance identified the risk assessment methodology and the use thereof in making corrective action decisions for hazardous waste generator facilities that are regulated by the CHWA and its implementing regulations (Colorado Hazardous Waste Regulations [CHWR]). The methodology identifies a three-step screen approach for evaluating corrective action at a SWMU. This screen deals solely with hazardous constituents identified in CHWR regulations 1007-3 section 261.

The first screen is a comparison to background and/or detection limits. Exceeding the detection limits or background levels (both defined in this guidance) would require screening steps two and three. SWMU or release sites that meet the levels prescribed in the criteria identified are considered "clean" and corrective action would not be necessary.

In addition, the July 27, 1990, Federal Register proposes 40 CFR §264.514, which presents a mechanism by which a permittee may request a permit modification to effectively terminate further requirements at a RCRA facility where no further action is justified.

For IHSSs that have interim status under RCRA, the closure process is defined within correspondence to DOE from CDPHE (1992). Substantive requirements were to be included as part of an IM/IRA and Closure Plan combined document for public comment. However, for NFAs, an IM/IRA may not be required. In this case, the Closure Plan could be included as a combined Proposed Plan/Closure Plan for public comment. In this situation, modification of the CHWA Permit for Rocky Flats may have to proceed as a separate process after the CAD/ROD

is adopted. For interim status units (e.g., IHSSs) RCRA Clean Closure Certification by an independent engineer is a requirement for NFA.

1.3 Exposure Pathway—Generic Site Conceptual Model

The key criterion in proposing an NFA decision is the determination of whether any actual or potential risk to human health or the environment exists. In order for a public health or environmental threat to exist, a complete pathway for exposure must exist between a site and a receptor. Individual components of an exposure pathway from the generic site conceptual model for the *No Further Action Justification Document for Rocky Flats Plant Low-Priority Sites (Operable Unit 16)* (DOE, 1993) are shown in Figure 1.

An exposure pathway is defined as "a unique mechanism by which a population may be exposed to chemicals at or originating from the site" (EPA, 1989). As shown in Figure 1, a credible exposure pathway must include a contaminant source; a release mechanism, a transport medium, an exposure route, and a receptor. These individual components of an exposure pathway are defined as follows:

- Contaminant Source: A contaminant source includes contaminants and/or contaminated environmental media associated with historical operations/occurrences at each IHSS.
- Release Mechanisms: Release mechanisms are physical and chemical processes by which contaminants are released from the source. A conceptual model identifies primary release mechanisms, which release contaminants directly from the IHSSs, and secondary release mechanisms, which release contaminants from environmental media.
- Retention or Transport Medium: A retention or transport medium is one into which contaminants are released from the source and from which contaminants may be released to a receptor (or to another medium by a secondary release mechanism). Primary transport media include air, soil, surface water, groundwater, and biota.
- Exposure Route: An exposure route is an avenue through which contaminants are physiologically incorporated by a receptor and include inhalation, ingestion, dermal contact, and external irradiation.




Figure 1. Exposure Pathway--Generic Site Conceptual Model

- Receptor: A receptor is a population affected by contamination released from a site. Potential human receptors for contaminants in IHSSs at RFETS include workers and visitors. Environmental receptors include flora and fauna. Offsite receptors could include residents or agricultural workers.

If an exposure pathway lacks any of these components, it is not complete, there is no risk, and NFA is warranted. However, if an exposure pathway is complete, an NFA can be considered if the risk present is within acceptable limits. The criteria for NFA decisions presented in Section 2.0 address both incomplete and complete exposure pathways. Section 3 describes the documentation requirements for making an NFA determination.

2.0 CRITERIA FOR NFA DECISIONS

The regulatory process for dispositioning a site suspected of contamination can be long and complex. However, there are several points in this process at which an IHSS, SA, AOC, or OU can be recommended for NFA. Criteria have been developed for each decision point to determine whether or not sufficient information is available to protect human health and the environment. Figure 2 shows these NFA decision points. The remainder of this section, which is organized according to Figure 2, describes the criteria to be met at each decision point.

2.1 Source Evaluation

The first step in evaluating a site is to determine what sources of contamination, if any, remain in an IHSS. If no existing source can be found, the exposure pathway is incomplete and the IHSS can be recommended for NFA. Lack of contaminant source is the only element of an incomplete exposure pathway that can be addressed without undertaking a full risk assessment. The remaining components of an exposure pathway (release mechanisms, retention or transport medium, exposure route, and receptor) are all evaluated during the risk assessment process.

The NFA criteria for demonstrating a lack of contaminant source are site specific. Historical information must be reviewed to determine whether or not an NFA decision may be appropriate at an early stage of a site investigation. NFA justification can be accomplished using minimal investigation and characterization resources if adequate historical release information and data are available; additional environmental sampling may not always be necessary. If it appears that an existing contaminant source is lacking in an IHSS, an NFA determination may be made without the need to collect additional environmental samples (Decision Point 1).




Figure 2. Decision Points for NFA Recommendations

As seen in Figure 2, an NFA recommendation at Decision Point 1 may be made in at least three circumstances, where a lack of contaminant source is indicated. These circumstances have already resulted in successful NFA determinations for IHSSs at RFETS. The final No Further Action Justification Document (NFAJD) for OU16 (DOE, 1993) describes these circumstances, which are demonstrated in the following examples:

1. In IHSS 185, a 1986 4-gal solvent spill was cleaned up immediately, using a commercial absorbent. This solvent was not detected in subsequent groundwater sampling. Based on this evidence and additional physicochemical rationale, no action was warranted for this IHSS.
2. In early 1980, 155 gallons of antifreeze, containing 25 percent ethylene glycol, were released from Building 708 through a buried culvert (IHSS 192) into Walnut Creek. A fate and transport degradation model run using the physicochemical characteristics of ethylene glycol indicated that it was completely degraded through natural attenuation, resulting in an NFA decision for this IHSS.
3. A 1979 break in a steam condensate line discharged steam condensate water containing low levels of tritium onto a paved area (IHSS 194). Tritium levels in steam condensate water samples were within background activity levels, considering the half life of tritium and the time since the discharge; no action was warranted.

As with the IHSSs in OU16, this type of NFA determination may be useful for evaluating IHSSs in the Industrial Area at RFETS. However, if adequate historical release information and current environmental data are not available to make an NFA determination, an IHSS would be progressed to the next step in the process, which could include scoping the site investigation to obtain additional data.

2.2 Background Comparisons

If a review of historical release information/data indicates that a contaminant source may be present, an IHSS, usually as part of an OU, will undergo a background comparison. A background comparison is performed to distinguish between constituents that are associated with site activities and those associated with background conditions. If sufficient data are available, a statistical methodology is used to conduct the background comparison (i.e.,

potential chemicals of concern [PCOC] identification) for nonanthropogenic compounds. A five-phase methodology (Figure 3), used to determine if an inorganic constituent exceeds background levels, was developed and approved by DOE, EPA Region VIII, and CDPHE. This methodology is detailed in the *Human Health Risk Assessment Methodology for RFETS* (DOE, 1995a) and EG&G Interoffice Correspondence (EG&G, 1995). In addition, examples of the application of background comparison at RFETS can be found in the site-specific letter reports for OU5 (DOE, 1994a) and OU6 (DOE, 1994b).

In a statistical background comparison, PCOCs are determined on an OU-wide basis for each environmental medium. Organic chemicals are assumed to be man-made and are not compared to background. Professional judgement, using spatial, temporal, or pattern-recognition concepts, must be applied to ensure the background data set is appropriate for comparison to the OU data set (for example, geologic conditions should be considered). If appropriate background data sets are not available (such as with OU3 lake sediments), a weight-of-evidence approach may be used to provide background benchmark values. Professional judgment must also be used to identify IHSSs or OUs where analyte- or medium-specific data are insufficient to run statistical background comparisons (e.g., in data sets with limited sample size or greater than 80% nondetects). In these cases, it may be more appropriate to use only the Hot Measurement Test (i.e., the maximum detected concentration of an analyte is compared to the background 99% upper tolerance limit [UTL_{99/99}] for that analyte) as a background comparison.

If medium-specific environmental data collected from an IHSS are shown to be at or below background levels for inorganic chemicals, and no organic chemicals are detected in that medium (Decision Point 2), that IHSS may become a candidate for NFA. If PCOCs are identified for an IHSS, the data must be analyzed using the risk-based screening processes described in Section 2.3.




Figure 3. Background Comparison/PCOC Selection

2.3 Risk-Based Screening of Chemicals

An IHSS having PCOCs (inorganic and/or organic), as indicated through a background comparison described in Section 2.2, must undergo a risk-based screening of chemicals before it can be recommended for no action. The purpose of conducting a risk-based screen is to reduce the number of IHSSs that are required to undergo a CERCLA baseline risk assessment. Human health risks are evaluated using either the CDPHE conservative screen (Section 2.3.1) or a screening-level risk evaluation (Section 2.3.2); ecological risks are screened using Tier 2 of the ecological risk assessment (ERA) process (Section 2.3.3).

2.3.1 CDPHE Conservative Screen

The CDPHE conservative screen was developed by the State of Colorado to ensure that the requirements of RCRA are met. The CDPHE conservative screen was incorporated by DOE, EPA, and CDPHE into the data aggregation process used in human health risk assessment (HHRA) for RFETS. This screen is one method used by DOE, EPA, and CDPHE to make decisions regarding no action, voluntary corrective action, or further analysis through an HHRA. A CDPHE conservative screen is conducted in accordance with the guidance provided in the *Human Health Risk Assessment Methodology for RFETS* (DOE, 1995) and shown in Figure 4.

In the CDPHE conservative screen, SAs are delineated that contain organic PCOCs above reporting limits and/or inorganic PCOCs at concentrations above the arithmetic mean plus two standard deviations of the background data. An SA consists of one or more IHSSs that are grouped together based on historical use, site characterization, PCOC types and concentrations, affected media, and rates of migration.

The CDPHE conservative screen is considered conservative based on the following requirements of the process:




Figure 4. CDPHE Conservative Screen

- The risk-based concentrations (RBCs) ratio sum for each SA is calculated using the maximum detected concentration for an analyte, rather than the 95% upper confidence limit used in CERCLA risk assessments.
- The chemical- and medium-specific RBC is calculated assuming direct residential exposure, rather than an exposure scenario more appropriate to the site. Land use recommendations made by the Rocky Flats Future Site Working Group (1995) primarily include open space use for the buffer zone and environmental technology (industrial/office) use for the industrial area; future onsite residential land use was not recommended.
- The RBC is calculated using a carcinogenic risk of $10E-6$ and a noncarcinogenic hazard quotient of 1.0, rather than using the $10E-4$ to $10E-6$ risk range used in CERCLA risk assessments.
- The residential scenario is based on exposure assumptions and standard default factors provided for the reasonably maximum exposed (RME) residential receptor; CERCLA risk assessments also provide risk estimates for the central tendency (average) receptors.
- The CDPHE conservative screen includes data for soil samples collected to a depth of 12 feet in the surface soil calculations, rather than soil from the 0- to 2-foot interval, which is more typical of CERCLA HHRA's.

The chemical-specific ratios are summed for each medium, with carcinogenic ratios summed separately from those analytes causing noncarcinogenic effects. The ratio sums for each medium are then added to get a total sum ratio for an SA. The ratios are compared to the CDPHE conservative screen decision criteria used to designate source areas as candidates for no action, for further evaluation in the HHRA, or for possible early action (Decision Point 3). Source areas with ratio sums less than 1 may become candidates for NFA pending an evaluation of the risk associated with potential dermal contact. For source areas with ratio sums between 1 and 100, and greater than 100, DOE may evaluate the source area further in the HHRA and/or pursue a voluntary early action alternative, respectively. A CDPHE conservative screen letter report is prepared to summarize the results of this screen and is used as a reference document to justify a NFA decision.

Those IHSSs or SAs within an OU that do not pass the CDPHE conservative screen are grouped into areas of concern (AOCs) for further evaluation in a HHRA. AOCs are defined as

one or more SAs grouped spatially in close proximity that have historically similar waste streams (i.e., similar PCOCs).

2.3.2 Screening-Level Risk Evaluation

During July 1995, Rocky Flats Future Site Use Working Group (1995) presented final land use recommendations to the Rocky Flats Local Impacts Initiative, DOE, CDPHE, and EPA. In general, this group of local RFETS stakeholders recommended that the buffer zone remain as open space and that the industrial area be used for environmental technology (commercial/industrial). This recommendation supports the Jefferson County Board of County Commissioners resolution requesting that the buffer zone remain open space. Because no plans exist for onsite residential development, the use of the CDPHE conservative screen is no longer appropriate to screen IHSSs for risk in the future. However, for IHSSs or SAs that have already undergone and passed the CDPHE conservative screen as part of an ongoing RFI/RI process, these screening results will be used as justification for making NFA recommendations.

A sitewide, screening-level risk evaluation has recently been developed as part of a new, risk-based ranking process to prioritize IHSSs at RFETS (RMRS, 1995). This screening-level risk evaluation will be completed using all currently available data for surface soils, subsurface soils, and ground water. Where applicable, detailed risk assessments for OUs will be utilized.

The site-wide risk evaluation will use the office worker, construction worker and open space scenarios and evaluate the most likely exposure pathways. The exposure scenarios were chosen to conform to the final recommendations of the Rocky Flats Future Site Use Working Group (1995) and to discussions held among EPA, CDPHE, DOE, and EG&G in February 1995.

The office worker scenario represents exposures to surface soils for most of the work force and represents risks in the industrial area. The open space scenario is used for surface soil exposures in the buffer zone, because this is the recommended land use. The construction

worker scenario represents exposures to subsurface soil and the risk associated with the frequent excavation work and soil disturbances that occur at the site.

Under currently expected land uses and agreed upon exposure scenarios, there are no exposures to ground water unless it surfaces in seeps, streams, or ponds. The open space scenario represents the most probable future exposures in the buffer zone. Therefore, the open space exposure scenario was chosen in order to conservatively estimate potential risks to the public from ground water. For this evaluation, it is assumed that maximum concentrations of chemicals found in ground water represent the highest potential concentrations to which an open space user might be exposed at a seep or other surface water location. The maximum concentrations are compared to open-space surface water programmatic preliminary remedial goals (PPRGs) to estimate risk. This is a conservative comparison, because concentrations will tend to be reduced by natural attenuation.

The process for conducting the screening-level risk evaluation is detailed in the *Final Implementation Plan for the FY95 Performance Measure: Environmental Risk Prioritization* (RMRS, 1995) and shown in Figure 5.

A ratio will be computed by dividing all inorganic analyte concentrations greater than the background, and all detected organic analyte concentrations greater than the appropriate PPRG by the appropriate PPRG. The resulting ratio will approximate a rough order of magnitude risk (i.e. a ratio of 100 will approximate a rough order of magnitude cancer risk of $10E-4$). All constituents with a ratio greater than one will be carried through the evaluation. Areas where constituents do not have a ratio greater than one will be assigned to the low priority classification and will later be evaluated for data sufficiency or potential no action closure.




Figure 5. Screening-level Risk Evaluation

Using the recent information from ongoing characterization activities and risk assessments, plus the results of the screening level risk evaluation, a substantial number of IHSSs and SAs may be identified where no action may be required. These sites will be categorized as potential NFA areas on the prioritization list. These will be evaluated further to ensure that sufficient data are available to pursue an NFA determination, with the concurrence of DOE, EPA, and CDPHE. Other IHSSs and SAs with insufficient data will be recommended for further investigation.

In summary, the CDPHE conservative screen will be used to make no action decisions on those IHSSs or SAs that have already passed the screen. For IHSSs that will undergo risk-based screening in the future, such as in the Industrial Area, the screening-level risk evaluation will be the tool used for determining whether or not an NFA recommendation is warranted. Regardless of which HHRA screening tool is used for an IHSS or SA, a Tier 2 ERA screen must also be conducted and passed before it can be recommended for NFA.

2.3.3 Ecological Risk Assessment Tier 2 Screen

After an IHSS or source area passes the CDPHE conservative screen, it must then pass a screening level ERA before it can become a candidate for an NFA decision. This screening process is performed according to the EPA's eight-step guidance (draft) on conducting ERAs at Superfund sites (EPA, 1994). To ease the preparation of ERAs at RFETS, a sitewide ecological risk assessment methodology (ERAM) has been developed which is consistent with this eight-step guidance (EPA, 1994).

The first two steps of the EPA process, which is shown in Figure 6, are used to provide a screening-level risk assessment that is intended to allow risk assessors and managers to rapidly determine whether a site poses an ecological risk. The purpose of a screening-level risk assessment is to detect whether a significant ecological risk exists at the site. A risk does not exist unless: (1) the stressor (a physical, chemical, or biological entity [EPA, 1992]) can cause one or more adverse effects and (2) it co-occurs with or contacts an ecological component long




Figure 6. Screening-Level ERA

enough and at sufficient intensity to elicit the identified adverse effect (EPA, 1994). In Step 2, risks are estimated by comparing maximum analyte concentrations with screening-level ecotoxicity benchmarks. This step, which is also part of Decision Point 3 shown in Figure 2, is used to evaluate whether or not the site preliminary screening is adequate to determine if an ecological threat exists (EPA, 1994).

Subsequent steps of the EPA methodology are more detailed and are aimed at refining risk estimates and determining site-specific cleanup goals. If none of the PCOCs are present at ecotoxic concentrations, the site is considered to present a negligible or *de minimis* risk and a more detailed quantitative risk assessment is not warranted (EPA, 1994).

The ERAM was specifically designed as guidance for conducting ERAs at RFETS. This site-specific guidance contains the necessary information to accomplish the first two steps in the EPA guidance. Specific RFETS guidance documents include:

- *ERAM Technical Memorandum No. 2 (TM2), Sitewide Conceptual Model* (DOE, 1995b), which helps identify environmental stressors and the potentially complete exposure pathways that will become the focus of the ERA (DOE, 1995b); and
- *ERAM Technical Memorandum No. 3 (TM3), Ecological Chemicals of Concern Screening Methodology* (DOE, 1995c), which describes a tiered screening process for identifying chemicals at potentially ecotoxic concentrations.

Tier 1 describes the screening process used in the background comparison stage. Tier 2 describes the actual screening of PCOCs and comparison to benchmarks with the subsequent generation of hazard quotient (HQ) values. The HQ is the result of the exposure estimate divided by the benchmark. The screen is conservative because it assumes that receptors are continuously exposed to the highest concentrations detected and evaluates potential toxicity to individuals and not adverse effects to populations or communities.

At the screening stage, the HQ approach is used to estimate risk by comparing site-specific estimates of exposure to ecotoxicological benchmarks. It should be assumed that the receptor will spend all of its time in areas of maximum PCOC concentrations. Also, the PCOC content of

all food consumed by the receptor will be assumed to be equal to the maximum concentration for that particular medium. (Note: The HQ used in the ERA is different than the HQ used in the HHRA to report noncarcinogenic effects of chemicals on humans.)

If the HQ for a PCOC is greater than one, then that analyte is identified as a potential ECOC and is subject to further analysis in Tier 3. However, if HQs for each of the PCOCs for a source area are below 1, the screen indicates that none of the PCOCs are present at potentially ecotoxic concentrations and should not be subjected to further analysis in Tier 3.

In summary, an IHSS or SA that fails to pass any of the screening criteria described in this section will be grouped with similar IHSSs or SAs into an area of concern (AOC) and will undergo a CERCLA baseline risk assessment (HHRA and/or ERA), as described in Section 2.4.

2.4 CERCLA Baseline Risk Assessment

CERCLA, as implemented by the NCP, establishes the overall approach for determining appropriate remedial actions at Superfund sites. The overall mandate of the Superfund program is to protect human health and the environment from current and potential threats posed by uncontrolled hazardous substance releases. To support this mandate, EPA developed the *Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund* (RAGS) (EPA, 1989a and 1989b), which addresses both the human health and ecological risk assessments in Volumes I and II, respectively. Within remedial investigation reports, baseline risk assessments provide an evaluation of the potential threat to human health and the environment in the absence of any remedial action. The baseline risk assessment (BRA) therefore consists of a human health risk assessment (HHRA) and an ecological risk assessment (ERA).

The risk assessment methodology used at RFETS has been jointly adapted to this site by DOE, EPA, CDPHE, and EG&G from EPA guidance. RFETS guidance to the HHRA process is provided in the *Human Health Risk Assessment Methodology for RFETS* (EG&G 1995). The methodology for conducting an RFETS ERA is based on the *Ecological Risk Assessment*

Guidance for Superfund: Process for Designing and Conducting Ecological Risk Assessments (EPA, 1994). Site-specific guidance for conducting ERAs is provided in *Ecological Risk Assessment Methodology for Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site* (Vertucci et al., 1995).

2.4.1 Human Health Risk Assessment Methodology

As established in Section 2.3, an AOC must undergo a BRA if it does not pass through the risk-based screen. Figure 7 briefly outlines the steps taken in conducting an HHRA, which consist of the following elements:

- Identifying COCs
- Developing exposure scenarios
- Describing fate and transport models
- Calculating intake factors
- Conducting a toxicity assessment
- Conducting a risk characterization
- Analyzing uncertainty in the HHRA
- Documenting human health risks in the BRA.

An RFI/RI report includes both a summary of risks for a site and a list of recommendations. However, the final decisions on whether or not a site will be recommended for NFA or if a remedial action is warranted is made by the risk managers from DOE, EPA, and CDPHE. Below are a few guidelines in making these risk-management decisions.

1. An IHSS, AOC, or OU is a candidate for an NFA decision if the carcinogenic risk estimated using the exposure factors for the appropriate receptor (e.g., open-space recreational user, office worker, construction worker, resident) is $10E-6$ or below and the noncarcinogenic hazard index (HI) is below 1.
2. An IHSS, AOC, or OU may become a candidate for an NFA decision if the carcinogenic risk estimated, using the exposure factors for the appropriate receptor (e.g., open-space recreational user, office worker, construction worker, resident) is between $10E-6$ and $10E-4$, the noncarcinogenic HI is between 1 and 10, and neither risk managers nor stakeholders can provide nonrisk-based justification that a remedial action is warranted.




Figure 7. Human Health Risk Assessment Process

OSWER Directive 9355.0-30 (EPA, 1991b) provides guidance to support the above criteria:

"Generally, where the baseline risk assessment indicates that a cumulative site risk to an individual using reasonable maximum exposure assumptions for either current or future land use exceeds the 10^{-4} lifetime excess cancer risk end of the risk range, action under CERCLA is generally warranted at the site. For sites where the cumulative site risk to an individual based on reasonable maximum exposure for both current and future land use is less than 10^{-4} , action generally is not warranted, but may be warranted if a chemical specific standard that defines acceptable risk is violated or unless there are noncarcinogenic effects or an adverse environmental impact that warrants action. A risk manager may also decide that a lower level of risk to human health is unacceptable and that remedial action is warranted, for example, there are uncertainties in the risk assessment results. Records of Decision for remedial actions taken at sites posing risk within the 10^{-4} to 10^{-6} risk range must explain why remedial action is warranted."

2.4.2 Ecological Risk Assessment Methodology

If data from a given IHSS or source fail to pass a Tier 2 ecological evaluation ($HQ > 1$ for any analyte), the data are evaluated using a Tier 3 ERA screen, which is basically equivalent to the concentration/toxicity screening conducted during the HHRA. A Tier 3 ERA is a much more comprehensive evaluation of exposure pathways and a more accurate method for estimating exposure than a Tier 2 screening-level ERA. The Tier 3 exposure estimation includes methods that account for factors that modify the frequency, duration, and intensity of contact between a receptor and the contaminated media. Tier 3 evaluation results in a list of chemicals that are subjected to more detailed analysis in the ecological risk characterization.

ERA risk characterization integrates the exposure assessment and the effects assessment. It includes a description of risk in terms of the assessment endpoints, a discussion of the ecological significance of the effects, a summary of the overall confidence in the ERA, and a discussion of possible risk management strategies. Figure 8 presents the ERA process used at RFETS.




Figure 8. Ecological Risk Assessment Process at RFETS

Risk characterization for each ERA study area involves quantifying exposure by using site-specific data and exposure models and comparing this exposure to dose-response information from the scientific literature. Risk characterization also involves interpretation of biological tests (e.g., toxicity tests, benthic macroinvertebrate studies) to determine any measurable ecological effects of the chemical stressors.

Risk characterization requires that different types of data be evaluated together. Balancing and interpreting the different types of data can be a major task and frequent communication between scientists from DOE, EPA, and CDPHE is essential to defensible risk characterization. Because no solid criteria exist for determining ecological risk, professional judgment will be used at this step in the NFA process. There should be agreement on the interpretation of site-specific data, the exposure assessment, the results of ecological effects studies, and the strength of the evidence linking dose-response, measured effects, and site COCs.

3.0 NFA DECISION DOCUMENTATION

A recommendation for an NFA decision for a site (i.e., IHSS, SA, AOC, or OU) is presented to DOE, EPA, and CDPHE as either an NFA Justification Document (NFAJD) or an NFA Decision Agreement (NFADA). Documentation justifying the NFA decision process must accompany an NFA recommendation to support a CAD/ROD determination. Characterization of sites, including the evaluation of data to determine risk, is usually included within RFI/RI reports. For those sites evaluated within an RFI/RI Report or a Letter Report (for those IHSSs that pass the CDPHE conservative screen), an NFAJD is not necessary. For those sites not evaluated as part of an RFI/RI, an NFAJD must be prepared to present an evaluation of existing information and data to support a scientifically and legally defensible NFA decision.

3.1 NFA Justification Documents

NFAJDs are prepared to support NFA decisions on (1) IHSSs for which a source evaluation has determined a lack of contaminant source, (2) IHSSs for which a background comparison has indicated a lack of contaminant source, and (3) IHSSs or SAs for which a screening-level risk evaluation has indicated no risk is present. Depending upon the site being evaluated, NFAJDs will vary in the type, quantity, and quality of information and data. EPA, CDPHE, DOE, and the RFETS contractor must determine whether or not available data are necessary and sufficient to perform a given process evaluation that must be made for each site. Appropriate guidance (e. g., EPA/CERCLA, CDPHE/CHWA IAG) is available to help determine if necessary and sufficient data are available to perform background comparisons and/or a risk-based screening of chemicals. An evaluation of data quality should be included in the NFAJD to determine whether or not the data quality objective (DQO) process (generally presented in the OU work plan or sampling and analysis plan) was used during the investigation.

An example table of contents for an NFAJD is presented as Table 1. The table of contents will be modified, as necessary, to meet site-specific needs. It is also intended that all NFAJDs be as brief as possible, including only the necessary and sufficient information required to support a scientifically and legally defensible decision.

Table 1. Generalized Table of Contents for an NFA Justification Document

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Purpose of Document
- 1.2 Background Information

2.0 FIELD INVESTIGATION

- 2.1 Site Investigation Objectives, including DQOs
- 2.2 Site History and Available Data
- 2.3 Investigation Activities
- 2.4 Data Quality and Usability

3.0 PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS

- 3.1 Surface Features
- 3.2 Geology
- 3.3 Hydrogeology
- 3.4 Ecology

4.0 NATURE AND EXTENT OF CONTAMINATION

- 4.1 Source Evaluation
- 4.2 Site Conceptual Model
- 4.3 Background Comparison
- 4.4 Nature and Extent of Contamination

5.0 EVALUATION OF RISKS

- 5.1 Risk-based Screening of Chemicals
- 5.2 Summary of Baseline Risk Assessment

6.0 NFA JUSTIFICATION

7.0 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8.0 REFERENCES

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF APPENDICES

3.2 NFA Decision Agreements

NFADAs are intended to coordinate the results of the substantive and technical requirements (i.e., NFA decision criteria) with the administrative and legal requirements of the CAD/ROD process. After a NFAJD is completed and approved for a given site, an NFADA should be prepared to document EPA, CDPHE, and DOE agreement on a selected remedy. NFADAs can also be prepared (1) for IHSSs or SAs for which a supporting OU Letter Report is available or (2) for AOCs for which supporting documentation for no action is presented in an RFI/RI report. Under these circumstances, NFAJDs are not required. NFADAs will include a Memorandum of Understanding, with signature lines for EPA, CDPHE, and DOE concurrence.

NFADAs are intended to be "place keepers." A site can be placed on hold with an NFADA until the preparation of a Proposed Plan, which may recommend closure of several sites in one CAD/ROD. Proposed Plans can be developed for individual sites, groups of sites, OUs and unrelated sites, depending upon the timing of any given closure or closures being pursued. Because NFADAs will be used to prepare Proposed Plans, the format for an NFADA should be similar to that of a Proposed Plan. Appropriate guidance (e.g., EPA/CERCLA, IAG) for preparation of Proposed Plans is currently available; therefore, no table of contents or additional guidance is provided for preparation of NFADAs within this document.

For IHSSs that have interim status under RCRA, the closure process is defined within correspondence to DOE from CDPHE (1992). Substantive requirements were to be included as part of an IM/IRA and Closure Plan combined document for public comment. However, for NFAs, an IM/IRA may not be required. In this case, the Closure Plan could be included as a combined Proposed Plan/Closure Plan for public comment. In this situation, modification of the CHWA Permit for Rocky Flats may have to proceed as a separate process after the CAD/ROD is adopted. For interim status units (e.g., IHSSs) RCRA Clean Closure Certification by an independent engineer is a requirement for NFA.

4.0 REFERENCES

- Colorado Department of Health, 1992. Correspondence from Gary W. Baughman, CDH, to Frazer Lockhart, DOE. Closure Process for RCRA Units Under the Interagency Agreement. (May 29)
- EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc., 1995. Interoffice Correspondence MAS-002-95. Summary of Dr. Gilbert's Letter Report concerning the Comparison of Operable Unit (OU) versus Background Data: Application of Professional Judgment. (January 10)
- Federal Register. Proposed Rules. Vol.55, No. 145, Friday, July 27, 1990, p. 30613.
- Rocky Flats Future Site Working Group, 1995. Rocky Flats Future Site Working Group Recommendations for Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site. Prepared for Rocky Flats Local Impacts Initiative, DOE RFFO, CDPHE, and EPA. (July)
- U. S. Department of Energy (DOE), 1993. Final No Further Action Justification Document for Rocky Flats Plant Low-Priority Sites (Operable Unit 16). Prepared for DOE Rocky Flats Field Office by EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc., Golden, CO. (October)
- DOE, 1994a. Letter Report on the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment Source Area Delineation and Risk-based Conservative Screen and the Environmental Protection Agency Areas of Concern Delineation for the Human Health Risk Assessment for Woman Creek Priority Drainage Area (Operable Unit No. 5), Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site. Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site, Golden, CO. (November 28)
- DOE, 1994b. Letter Report on the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment Source Area Delineation and Risk-based Conservative Screen and the Environmental Protection Agency Areas of Concern Delineation for the Human Health Risk Assessment for Walnut Creek Priority Drainage Area (Operable Unit No. 6), Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site. Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site, Golden, CO. (October)
- DOE, 1995a. Human Health Risk Assessment Methodology for RFETS (Draft). Prepared for DOE Rocky Flats Field Office by EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc., RF/ER-95-0088, Golden, CO.
- DOE, 1995b. Ecological Risk Assessment Methodology Technical Memorandum No. 2, Sitewide Conceptual Model (Draft Final). Prepared for DOE Rocky Flats Field Office by EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc., Golden, CO. (March)

DOE, 1995c. Ecological Risk Assessment Methodology Technical Memorandum No. 3, Ecological Chemicals of Concern (ECOCs) (Draft Final). Prepared for DOE Rocky Flats Field Office by EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc., Golden, CO. (April)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 1989a. Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund, Volume I: Human Health Evaluation Manual (Part A) (Interim Final). Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, EPA/540/1-89/002, Washington D.C. (December)

EPA, 1989b. Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund, Volume II: Environmental Evaluation Manual (Interim Final). Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, EPA/540/1-89/001, Washington D.C. (March)

EPA, 1991a. Guide to Developing Superfund No Action, Interim Action, and Contingency Remedy RODS. Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Quick Reference Fact Sheet 9355.3-02FS-3, Washington D.C. (April)

EPA, 1991b. Role of the Baseline Risk Assessment in Superfund Remedy Selection Decisions. OSWER Directive 9355.0-30, Washington, D.C. (April 22)

EPA, 1992. Guidance on Preparing Superfund Decision Documents (Preliminary Draft). Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Directive 9335.3-02, Washington D.C. (January)

EPA, 1994. Ecological Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund: Process for Designing and Conducting Ecological Risk Assessments (Review Draft). Environmental Response Team, Edison, NJ. (September 26)

EPA, Undated. Record of Decision Checklist for No Action.

Vertucci, F.A., Lavelle, B., Lewis, M., Love, J., and Wickstrom, M., 1995. Ecological Risk Assessment Methodology for Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site. IN: Proceedings for ER '95, Denver, Colorado (August 13-17)